

REMARKS

Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Entry of the above amendments is courteously requested in order to place all claims in this application in allowable condition and/or to place the non-allowed claims in better condition for consideration on appeal.

Claims 7 and 8 remain in this application. Claims 1 through 6 have been cancelled. No claims have been withdrawn. Claims 9 through 24 have been added.

Claims 1 through 8 have previously been rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Parham in view of Johnson.

Claim 7, requires in part, "said periphery wall having an upper edge, an entirety of the upper edge of said periphery wall lying in a single plane" and ", said cavity extending into the inner surface of said periphery wall *without* decreasing the uniform height of said periphery wall, said cavity being arcuate in shape". These features of the invention, which are clearly illustrated in the drawings (particularly Figure 3) permit the claimed cavity to receive the water nozzle (or other dispensing structure) of the bottle to facilitate central positioning of the bottle and resist lateral rolling of the bottle, while still resisting the bottle from riding up on the periphery wall as no portion of the inclined corner section of the water bottle (see Figure 2) is allowed to extend through the periphery wall of uniform height.

Both the Parham and the Johnson patents show a notch that does decrease a height of the respective perimeter walls, and neither Parham nor Johnson shows an upper edge that lies entirely in a single plane.

It is therefore submitted that the cited patents, and especially the allegedly obvious combination of Parham and Johnson set forth in the rejection of the Office Action, would not lead one skilled in the art to the

Appln. No. 10/622,946
Amendment dated November 22, 2006
Reply to Office Action mailed December 15, 2005

applicant's invention as required by claim 7. Further, claim 8, which depend from claim 7, also include the requirements discussed above and therefore are also submitted to be in condition for allowance.

Withdrawal of the §103(a) rejection of claims 8 and 9 is therefore respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In light of the foregoing amendments and remarks, early reconsideration and allowance of this application are most courteously solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

WOODS, FULLER, SHULTZ & SMITH P.C.



Date: Nov. 22, 2006

Jeffrey A. Proehl (Reg. No. 35,987)
Customer No. **40,158**
P.O. Box 5027
Sioux Falls, SD 57117-5027
(605)336-3890 FAX (605)339-3357